



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,114	10/11/2000	David Kunin	13062.1USU1	4941

23552 7590 11/24/2003
MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

BUI, KIEU OANH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

e

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/686,114

Applicant(s)

KUNIN ET AL.

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4&5. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 10-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,543,052 B1).

Regarding claim 10, Ogasawara discloses “a method of accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a television display which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television channel” (Fig. 4, col. 2/lines 19-40; and col. 3/lines 44-65 and col. 4/lines 28-51 as a user uses a remote control unit as a portable telephone for controlling a television display including Internet accessing/browsing via a television channel, and a microphone for capturing the voice signal from the user at the portable remote device 14). Furthermore, Ogasawara further discloses the step of “routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer for recognizing/interpreting/analyzing the voice signal and generating a command signal, the voice recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of users” (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition, col. 5/line 50

to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice recognizer, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and “accessing/browsing the Internet the requested Internet contents” (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37); and “presenting accessed/browsed Internet contents on the television via the television channel” (Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a TV screen for displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the conventional television reception functions).

As for claim 11, in further view of claim 10, Ogasawara further discloses “wherein the television channel is a cable television channel”, i.e., the user can view a normal television channel via a cable television channel since a cable provider 20 is included for service (Fig. 1/item 20, and col. 3/lines 15-24).

As for claim 12, in further view of claim 10, Ogasawara further discloses “wherein the television channel is a satellite television channel”, i.e., the television channel is a satellite television channel since a satellite system 16 is included (Fig. 1, and col. 3/lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 16, Ogasawara discloses “a computer program storage medium readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, the computer process comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a television display which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television channel” (i.e., Fig. 4/item 10 is a STB and it can read as a computer storage medium by a computing system, see col. 6/line 12-52; and Fig. 3, data encoder 40 and channel coder 46 are used for encoding a

computer program of instructions for executing computer process for converting the voice signal from the user and allowing the Internet access on the television, see col. 3/lines 15-52 for computer application software addressed, and col. 5/lines 9-49 for encoding processes as inputs as data or voice).

Ogasawara further discloses the step of “routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer; recognizing/ interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating command signals, the voice recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of users” (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition, col. 5/line 50 to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice recognizer, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and “accessing/ browsing the requested Internet contents; and presenting accessed/browsed Internet contents on the television via the television channel” (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37; and Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a TV screen for displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the conventional television reception functions).

Regarding claim 17, Ogasawara inherently discloses “a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, the computer process comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a television display which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television channel”, i.e., Ogasawara discloses a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave readable

by a computer system by using a known encoding technique or principles for transmitting data either for data or voice as data is handled by data encoder 40 and channel coder performs the encoding as packets with a header and a delimiter for demarcating the beginning and the end of the transmitted data embodied in a carrier wave (col. 5/lines 20-40, understood by Digital Signal Processing technique) as well as the step of encoding a computer program of instructions for executing computer process for converting the voice signal from the user and allowing the Internet access on the television, see col. 3/lines 15-52 for computer application software addressed, and col. 5/lines 9-49 for encoding processes as inputs as data or voice).

Ogasawara further discloses “routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer; recognizing/ interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating command signals, the voice recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of users” (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition, col. 5/line 50 to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice recognizer, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and “accessing/browsing the requested Internet contents; and presenting accessed/browsed Internet contents on the television via the television channel” (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37; and Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a TV screen for displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the conventional television reception functions).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,543,052 B1) in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822 B2/ or "Brown" hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Ogasawara discloses "a system for accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, comprising: a phone for receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a television display which is capable of displaying Internet contents via a television channel" (Fig. 4, col. 2/lines 19-40; and col. 3/lines 44-65 and col. 4/lines 28-51 as a user uses a remote control unit as a portable telephone for controlling a television display including Internet accessing/browsing via a television channel, and a microphone for capturing the voice signal from the user at the portable remote device 14). Furthermore, Ogasawara further discloses "a voice recognizer for recognizing/ interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating a command signal, the voice recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of users" (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and "an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents" (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet

browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37).

Ogasawara does not further disclose “a stack of computers, each of the stack of computers operable to access/browse the Internet and retrieve/organize requested Internet contents based on the command signal and the requested Internet contents being sent from at least one of the stack of computers to the television via the television channel”; however, Brown teaches in a web-based platform for interactive voice response that voice signals or speech signals from the user’s telephone is received at the web-based platform (Fig. 1/item 102, and col. 2/lines 55-59), and the platform further includes a voice recognizer, or namely (other name), a speech recognizer for recognizing, interpreting, and analyzing voice signals or speech signals transmitted from a plurality of users (col. 3/line 53 to col. 4/line 13) to generate control signals for accessing/browsing the Internet (col. 4/lines 47-63 & col. 5/lines 7-17); and Brown includes an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents (Fig. 2/item 110, and col. 3/lines 23-52) as well as a stack of computers as noted (Fig.1 and col. 3/lines 2-22) as the server 106-1 includes a group of computers as a stack of computers for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents based on each user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara’s system with Brown's detailed technique in using a web-based platform including a stack of computers as discussed in order to handle voice or speech commands from a plurality of users, using a stack of computers, via their handset telephones, which controls the television display and the accessing/browsing the Internet using

the web browser. The motivation for having a stack of computers as mentioned is to allow the multiple processing of a plurality of users as the users use their telephone for requesting simultaneous services to the system, and the system can effectively handle multiple transactions at the same time to various types of networks as suggested by Brown.

As for claim 2, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara further discloses “wherein the television channel is a cable television channel”, i.e., the user can view a normal television channel via a cable television channel since a cable provider 20 is included for service (Fig. 1/item 20, and col. 3/lines 15-24).

As for claim 3, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara further discloses “wherein the television channel is a satellite television channel”, i.e., the television channel is a satellite television channel since a satellite system 16 is included (Fig. 1, and col. 3/lines 53-65).

As for claim 7, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara and Brown disclose “wherein the voice recognizer is operated by *a supercomputer* coupled to a phone switching network”; as Brown suggests that the processor 130 can be any other type of digital data processor (col. 4/lines 14-30), which also coupled to a phone switching network or a PSTN (for Public Switching Telephone Network, see col. 4/lines 31-46). Furthermore, “a supercomputer” simply means a high-speed computer using advanced technologies (as defined by the Newton’s Telecom dictionary); therefore, the platform IVR 102 of Brown can be inherently understood as a supercomputer since it correlates and handles a plurality of networks, with a plurality of computers and servers, including the Internet, an Intranet, LAN, or WAN, a cable network, a satellite network as well as other networks such as a PSTN, a cellular or wireless and data networks (col. 2/line 61 to col. 3/line 22), if not, it can not perform the multitasking operation (or

communication) efficiently and effectively for a plurality of users within networks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Brown's computer system as "a supercomputer" as claimed in order to emphasize that a super fast computer is used for handling the operation of the present system, which also including a voice recognizer therein, for performing the communication tasks among the users within a plurality of networks as suggested by Brown.

As for claim 8, in further view of claim 1 above, Brown further discloses "wherein the stack of computers and the Internet browser are disposed in a cable system", i.e., Brown includes an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents (Fig. 2/item 110, and col. 3/lines 23-52) as well as a stack of computer (Fig. 1 and col. 3/lines 7-9) as the server includes a group of computers as a stack of computers for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents based on each user; and these parts are parts of the network 104 or disposed in the network, while the network 104 may represent a cable network (col. 2/line 61 to col. 3/line 22).

As for claim 9, in further view of claim 7 above, Brown further discloses "wherein the phone switching network is coupled to a plurality of phones for routing corresponding voice signals from the plurality of users to the voice recognizer for recognizing/interpreting/analyzing the corresponding voice signal and generating command signals to access/browse the Internet", i.e., network 109 represents a PSTN connected to a plurality of users at user interface device 108 for connecting to a speech recognizer 122 of the web-based IVR platform 102 for recognizing/interpreting/analyzing the corresponding voice signal and generating command signals to access/browse the Internet (as illustrated in Fig. 2, and see claim 1 above), and

although network 104 and 109 is illustrated separately (Fig. 1), they may be the same network or different portions of the same network (col. 3/lines 10-22).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822 B2) and Kim (US Patent no. 6,546,002 B1).

As for claim 4, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara and Brown do not further address the steps of “comprising a filter having an identification, wherein the phone has an identification, if the identification of the phone does not match with the identification of the filter, the filter filters out the requested Internet contents, and if the identification of the phone matches with the identification of the filter, the filter lets the requested Internet contents pass through such that the requested Internet contents are displayed on the television” and “comprising filtering out the requested Internet contents by a filter if an identification of the phone does not match with an identification of the filter, the filter letting the requested Internet contents pass through if the identification of the phone matches with the identification of the filter”; however, in a system for implementing an intelligent and mobile menu-interface agent using the Internet, Kim teaches a filter within a client side (Fig. 3/item 102 for Mobile Interface Agent MIA client, and Fig. 4 for a closer look at item 102 with a filter 210) for filtering out necessary and unnecessary items that the system processes, for instance, recognizing the user’s ID and many other parameters for whether to forward or reject the incoming calls based on a user profile (col. 10/lines 29-45 as the filter 210 enable and disable the user’s access based on the user profile), wherein the profile includes the user identification (Fig. 3 for profile data, and col. 8/lines 23-31), and the identification of the filter of each user is identified based on the setting up

of user ID on each MIA to create a personal ID on any machine on any platform for accessing the MIA 102 (including a filter therein), which can be part of a set top or a phone (see col. 14/lines 18-30 & col. 16/lines 20-35 for this issue as MIA can be integrated into a set top box).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara and Brown's system with a filter as taught by Kim in order to filter and/or granting services from the Internet as if the filter compares the user identification, i.e., a user ID, against the identification of filter as explained earlier, in comparing and matching the user's identification for further processing such as allowing the Internet content going through to the user's display on the television.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above in view of Kim (US Patent no. 6,546,002 B1).

As for claim 13, in further view of claim 10 above, Ogasawara does not further show the steps of "comprising a filter having an identification, wherein the phone has an identification, if the identification of the phone does not match with the identification of the filter, the filter filters out the requested Internet contents, and if the identification of the phone matches with the identification of the filter, the filter lets the requested Internet contents pass through such that the requested Internet contents are displayed on the television" and "comprising filtering out the requested Internet contents by a filter if an identification of the phone does not match with an identification of the filter, the filter letting the requested Internet contents pass through if the identification of the phone matches with the identification of the filter"; however, in a system for implementing an intelligent and mobile menu-interface agent using the Internet, Kim teaches to include a filter within a client side (Fig. 3/item 102 for Mobile Interface Agent MIA client, and

Fig. 4 for a closer look at item 102 with a filter 210) for filtering out necessary and unnecessary items that the system processes, for instance, recognizing the user's ID and many other parameters for whether to forward or reject the incoming calls based on a user profile (col. 10/lines 29-45 as the filter 210 enable and disable the user's access based on the user profile), wherein the profile includes the user identification (Fig. 3 for profile data, and col. 8/lines 23-31), and the identification of the filter of each user is identified based on the setting up of user ID on each MIA to create a personal ID on any machine on any platform for accessing the MIA 102 (including a filter therein), which can be part of a set top or a phone (see col. 14/lines 18-30 & col. 16/lines 20-35 for this issue as MIA can be integrated into a set top box). T

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara's system with a filter as taught by Kim in order to filter and/or granting services from the Internet as if the filter compares the user identification, i.e., a user ID, against the identification of filter as explained earlier, in comparing and matching the user's identification for further processing such as allowing the Internet content going through to the user's display on the television.

7. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822 B2) and Lauder et al. (US Patent 6,253,238 B1).

Regarding claims 5-6, in further view of claim 1, Ogasawara and Brown do not further disclose the system "comprising a frame grabber, the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television until a subsequent user request being made" and "the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television for a period of time"; however, Lauder

teaches in an interactive cable television with frame grabber that a frame grabber can be used locally (within the user service control module) for requesting/capturing a set of video frames, or in other words, refreshing the content locally (if captured from the Internet, we've got the Internet content) of the receiving signals at the user's display (Fig. 14, and col. 14/lines 3-38) based on a subsequent user's request (col. 14/lines 6-17) and the Internet contents being refreshed are on the television for a period of time, for example, the frames can be displayed on the television for a while as the user requests a direct access to the grabbed frame without saving to the storage medium, a video frame is freezing for a while for the user (col. 14/lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara and Brown's system with the teaching technique of Lauder's frame grabber as disclosed in order to request, refresh, capture or obtain a video frame of broadcasting contents, i.e., via the Internet network, as taught by Lauder as preferred. The motivation for doing this is to capture a frame(s) of any interested video, either in real-time broadcasting, and save it to a storage medium for future recall as suggested by Lauder (col. 14/lines 30-58).

8. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above in view of Lauder et al. (US Patent 6,253,238 B1).

Regarding claims ~~4-5~~ 14-15, in further view of claim 10 above, Ogasawara does not further disclose the system "comprising a frame grabber, the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television until a subsequent user request being made" and "the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television for a period of time"; however, Lauder

teaches in an interactive cable television with frame grabber that a frame grabber can be used locally (within the user service control module) for requesting/capturing a set of video frames, or in other words, refreshing the content locally (if captured from the Internet, we've got the Internet content) of the receiving signals at the user's display (Fig. 14, and col. 14/lines 3-38) based on a subsequent user's request (col. 14/lines 6-17) and the Internet contents being refreshed are on the television for a period of time, for example, the frames can be displayed on the television for a while as the user requests a direct access to the grabbed frame without saving to the storage medium, a video frame is freezing for a while for the user (col. 14/lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ogasawara's system with the teaching technique of Lauder's frame grabber as disclosed in order to request, refresh, capture or obtain a video frame of broadcasting contents, i.e., via the Internet network, as taught by Lauder as preferred. The motivation for doing this is to capture a frame(s) of any interested video, either in real-time broadcasting, and save it to a storage medium for future recall as suggested by Lauder (col. 14/lines 30-58).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dagate et al. (US. Pat. No.6,577,605 B1) disclose a system and method for automatically distributing multimedia calls.

Wittman (US Pat. No. 6,243,676 B1) disclose the technique of searching and retrieving multimedia information.

Tran et al. (US Pat. No.6,157,935) disclose the remote data access and management system.

Aras et al. (US Pat. No.5,757,417) disclose a method and apparatus for screening audio-visual materials presented to a subscriber.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
November 18, 2003


**KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER**